

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 12 and 13, and addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claim 13 to correct the insufficient antecedent basis and to clarify the language used in the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 13.

III. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 10-12, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rodriguez (US 2004/0008790 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

“[A]n invention is anticipated if the same device, including all the claim limitations, is shown in a single prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention

must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim.” MPEP § 2131.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections because Rodriguez does not disclose, suggest or anticipate each and every feature of the amended claims. In particular, starting with independent claim 1, the amended claim recites:

An apparatus for recording multimedia data comprising:

a receiving unit for receiving a compressed multimedia signal;

a decoder unit for decoding the multimedia signal into a data stream having a predetermined format;

a data compression unit for reducing a data amount of the data stream by a certain amount and encoding the reduced data stream;

a compression select unit for *selecting a compressibility of the data compression unit*,

wherein the data compression unit reduces the data amount according to a compressibility *selected* by the compression select unit using a *selected one or more of frame reduction, format conversion, and resolution reduction*.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rodriguez does not anticipate the three compressibility options as recited in the amended claims. Specifically, Rodriguez does not disclose, teach, or suggest a compression select unit that “reduces the data amount according to a compressibility selected by the compression select unit using a selected one or more of frame reduction, format conversion, and resolution reduction”.

In exemplary embodiments of the present invention, the compression select unit generates a control signal that enables (i.e., selects) at least one of the frame

setting unit (removes even-numbered frames), the format conversion unit (converts a video signal having 4:4:2 format to a video signal having 4:2:0), and the scaler (reduces resolution of the video signal) by controlling the data conversion unit.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 12 to further clarify that all three compressibility options must be available in embodiments of the present invention for later selection by the compression select unit. Therefore, the compression select unit may select only one from the above compression options, or may select a combination from the above compression options.

In contradistinction to Applicant's claimed invention, Rodriguez, teaches that a downconverter 212 employs one or more filters solely to perform downconversion of the chroma signal components from the 4:2:2 color format to the 4:2:0 color format (*see* paragraph [0044]). Rodriguez is silent with respect to selecting from one or a combination of compression methods by enabling their respective units.

Therefore, Rodriguez does not disclose a compression select unit that "reduces the data amount according to a compressibility selected by the compression select unit using a selected one or more of frame reduction, format conversion, and resolution reduction". Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 10-12, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 12 comprises similar subject matter to that of claim 1 and is therefore distinguished from Rodriguez for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-11 and 13-22 are distinguished from Rodriguez at least for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1 and 12, respectively.

IV. Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-16, and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Rodriguez. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-16, and 18-20 are distinguished from Rodriguez at least for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 6 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Rodriguez, in view of Matsunaga et al. (U.S. 2002/0176503). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Dependent claims 6 and 17 are distinguished from Rodriguez at least for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1 and 12, respectively. Moreover, Matsunaga fails to cure the deficiencies of Rodriguez as discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul H. Nguyen-Ba
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: March 5, 2008